## Case 3:13-cr-00640-EMC Document 12 Filed 10/03/13 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR 3-640 EMC-1
Plaintiff, v.	) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME ) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Jontae Allen Defendant.	
Speedy Trial Act from 10 2 20.3, 2 by the continuance outweigh the best inter	record on 10 2013, 2013, the Court excludes time under the 013 to 10 2013, 2013 and finds that the ends of justice served est of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § ing and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuar See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)	ice would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. (B)(i).
defendants, the natu or law, that it is unreasonab	complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of re of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact ble to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ce would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, reise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ce would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ase commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (B)(iv).
necessary for effective prepared See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)	ce would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time aration, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  (B)(iv).  FILED
IT IS SO ORDERED.	OT 0 0010
DATED: 10/3/13	CT X 3 2013  CHARD W. WIEKING FINUS DISTRICT COURT FINUS DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defe	D. Mange